

Application No. 10/772,810Case No. N0187US**REMARKS****I. Examiner Interview**

Applicant's attorney appreciates the Examiner's courtesy in speaking with him on August 6, 2009, regarding the outstanding Final Office Action. The interview included discussion of the § 102 rejection of claim 25 made by the Examiner. Applicant submits that the comments below reflect the substance of the interview.

**II. Status**

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-23, and 28-30 have been canceled. Claims 6, 14, and 24 have been previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 25-27 are currently pending.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 21, 23, 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kogan (U.S. 2004/0021780). Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa, et al. (U.S. 6,657,666) in view of Pelletier (U.S. 6,690,883) and Kogan. Claims 8-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa, et al. in view of Pelletier. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa, et al. in view of Pelletier and further in view of Baron (U.S. 6,459,388). Claims 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kogan in view of Pelletier.

**Claim 25 and Dependents**

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, "requesting from a remotely located map service server a municipality name corresponding to the geographic coordinates associated with each of the plurality of pictures, the remotely located map service server including data that indicates whether a landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates" and "if the geographic coordinates associated with at least one of the plurality of pictures are determined to be coordinates in which the landmark is observable, receiving data indicating a name of the landmark." Kogan does not teach or suggest at least these features.

Application No. 10/772,810Case No. N0187US

Kogan discloses automatically annotating digital photographs with features within a camera's field of view. (Kogan, paragraph [0005]). A digital camera is used to determine the four end-points of the field of view of each photograph in terms of a global coordinate system. (Kogan, paragraph [0024]). The four latitude-longitude pairs are then used to query a database for physical and cultural features found within those coordinates for annotation purposes. (Kogan, paragraphs [0024] and [0026]).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a remotely located map service server including data that indicates whether a landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates. Kogan discloses a geographical database, such as the Geographical Names Information System ("GNIS"), but that is not the same as a server that includes data that indicates whether a landmark is observable from specific geographic coordinates. For example, Kogan discloses that four latitude-longitude pairs are sent to a database, and the database determines all physical and cultural features within that window. That is not the same as sending geographic coordinates associated with a picture to a map service server in which the map service server determines if a landmark is observable from the received coordinates based on indication data related to certain coordinates in the server. For example, Kogan will retrieve all data within the four latitude-longitude pairs provided, without any intelligence regarding whether a landmark is observable from a specific point. Kogan discloses nothing regarding receiving data indicating a name of a landmark only if it is observable from a certain point. Kogan will retrieve data even if there is something blocking the view of a landmark from a specific point.

Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 26-27 depend from allowable claim 25 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Application No. 10/772,810Case No. N0187US**IV. Summary**

It is respectfully asserted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Adil M. Musabji  
Reg. No. 58,728  
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC  
425 West Randolph Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 780-3054